

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., )  
Plaintiff, ) Case No.: 2:16-cv-00347-GMN-CWH  
vs. )  
THE WILLOWS HOMEOWNERS' )  
ASSOCIATION AKA THE WILLOWS HOA,) )  
*et al.*, )  
Defendants. )  
PREMIER ONE HOLDINGS, INC.; WEISUN )  
PROPERTY, INC., )  
Counterclaimants, )  
vs. )  
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., )  
Counter-defendant. )

---

Pending before the Court is the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, (ECF No. 42), filed by Plaintiff Bank of America, N.A., successor by merger to BAC Home Loans Servicing, LP f/k/a Countrywide Home Loans Servicing, LP (“BANA”). Defendants The Willows Homeowners’ Association (“HOA”) and Solera at Premier One Holdings, Inc. (“Premier One”) (collectively “Defendants”) filed Responses, (*see* ECF No. 43, 44), to which BANA filed a Reply, (*see* ECF No. 46). For the reasons discussed below, the Court **GRANTS** BANA’s Motion.

## I. BACKGROUND

BANA filed its Complaint on February 19, 2016, asserting claims involving the non-judicial foreclosure on real property located at 785 Crest Valley Place, Henderson, Nevada

1 89011 (the “Property”). (Compl. ¶ 8, ECF No. 1). On August 20, 2008, non-parties Michael A.  
2 Britain, Barbara J. Britain, and Tracy L. Baker purchased the Property by way of a loan in the  
3 amount of \$266,118.00 secured by a Deed of Trust (“DOT”) recorded August 28, 2008. (*Id.*  
4 ¶ 14).

5 On April 12, 2011, HOA, through its agent Absolute Collection Services, LLC  
6 (“Absolute”), recorded a notice of delinquent assessment lien. (*Id.* ¶ 18). On July 18, 2011,  
7 HOA recorded a notice of default and election to sell to satisfy the delinquent assessment lien.  
8 (*Id.* ¶ 19). Although BANA requested the super-priority amount HOA alleged was due, HOA  
9 did not provide this amount. (*Id.* ¶ 28). Nevertheless, BANA attempted to tender what it  
10 calculated as the super-priority amount to HOA, which HOA rejected. (*Id.* ¶¶ 29–30). On June  
11 7, 2013, HOA recorded a notice of trustee’s sale, and on September 23, 2013, HOA foreclosed  
12 on the Property. (*Id.* ¶¶ 22, 30). Premier One purchased the Property at the foreclosure sale  
13 pursuant to NRS § 116.1113. (*Id.* ¶ 31).

14 BANA asserts the following causes of action against various parties involved in the  
15 foreclosure and subsequent sales of the Property: (1) quiet title with a requested remedy of  
16 declaratory judgment; (2) breach of Nevada Revised Statute (“NRS”) 116.1113; (3) wrongful  
17 foreclosure; and (4) injunctive relief. (*Id.*).

18 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

19 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide for summary adjudication when the  
20 pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the  
21 affidavits, if any, show that “there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant  
22 is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). Material facts are those that  
23 may affect the outcome of the case. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986).  
24 A dispute as to a material fact is genuine if there is sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to  
25 return a verdict for the nonmoving party. *Id.* “Summary judgment is inappropriate if

1 reasonable jurors, drawing all inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, could return a verdict  
2 in the nonmoving party's favor." *Diaz v. Eagle Produce Ltd. P'ship*, 521 F.3d 1201, 1207 (9th  
3 Cir. 2008) (citing *United States v. Shumway*, 199 F.3d 1093, 1103–04 (9th Cir. 1999)). A  
4 principal purpose of summary judgment is "to isolate and dispose of factually unsupported  
5 claims." *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323–24 (1986).

6 In determining summary judgment, a court applies a burden-shifting analysis. "When  
7 the party moving for summary judgment would bear the burden of proof at trial, it must come  
8 forward with evidence which would entitle it to a directed verdict if the evidence went  
9 uncontested at trial. In such a case, the moving party has the initial burden of establishing  
10 the absence of a genuine issue of fact on each issue material to its case." *C.A.R. Transp.*  
11 *Brokerage Co. v. Darden Rests., Inc.*, 213 F.3d 474, 480 (9th Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). In  
12 contrast, when the nonmoving party bears the burden of proving the claim or defense, the  
13 moving party can meet its burden in two ways: (1) by presenting evidence to negate an  
14 essential element of the nonmoving party's case; or (2) by demonstrating that the nonmoving  
15 party failed to make a showing sufficient to establish an element essential to that party's case  
16 on which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial. *Celotex Corp.*, 477 U.S. at 323–24. If  
17 the moving party fails to meet its initial burden, summary judgment must be denied and the  
18 court need not consider the nonmoving party's evidence. *Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S.  
19 144, 159–60 (1970).

20 If the moving party satisfies its initial burden, the burden then shifts to the opposing  
21 party to establish that a genuine issue of material fact exists. *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v.*  
22 *Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986). To establish the existence of a factual dispute,  
23 the opposing party need not establish a material issue of fact conclusively in its favor. It is  
24 sufficient that "the claimed factual dispute be shown to require a jury or judge to resolve the  
25 parties' differing versions of the truth at trial." *T.W. Elec. Serv., Inc. v. Pac. Elec. Contractors*

1 *Ass 'n*, 809 F.2d 626, 631 (9th Cir. 1987). In other words, the nonmoving party cannot avoid  
2 summary judgment by relying solely on conclusory allegations that are unsupported by factual  
3 data. *Taylor v. List*, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989). Instead, the opposition must go  
4 beyond the assertions and allegations of the pleadings and set forth specific facts by producing  
5 competent evidence that shows a genuine issue for trial. *Celotex Corp.*, 477 U.S. at 324.

6 At summary judgment, a court's function is not to weigh the evidence and determine the  
7 truth but to determine whether there is a genuine issue for trial. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 249. The  
8 evidence of the nonmovant is "to be believed, and all justifiable inferences are to be drawn in  
9 his favor." *Id.* at 255. But if the evidence of the nonmoving party is merely colorable or is not  
10 significantly probative, summary judgment may be granted. *Id.* at 249–50.

## 11 **II. DISCUSSION**

12 BANA asserts claims against Defendants for quiet title, violation of NRS § 116.1113,  
13 wrongful foreclosure, and injunctive relief. The Court first considers the impact of the Ninth  
14 Circuit's ruling in *Bourne Valley Court Trust v. Wells Fargo Bank, NA*, 832 F.3d 1154 (9th Cir.  
15 2016), *cert. denied*, No. 16-1208, 2017 WL 1300223 (U.S. June 26, 2017), before turning to  
16 BANA's individual claims.

### 17 **A. The Scope and Effect of *Bourne Valley***

18 In *Bourne Valley*, the Ninth Circuit held that NRS § 116.3116's "'opt-in' notice scheme,  
19 which required a homeowners' association to alert a mortgage lender that it intended to  
20 foreclose only if the lender had affirmatively requested notice, facially violated the lender's  
21 constitutional due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution."  
22 *Bourne Valley*, 832 F.3d at 1156. Specifically, the Court of Appeals found that by enacting the  
23 statute, the legislature acted to adversely affect the property interests of mortgage lenders, and  
24 was thus required to provide "notice reasonably calculated, under all circumstances, to apprise  
25 interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their

1 objections.” *Id.* at 1159. The statute’s opt-in notice provisions therefore violated the Fourteenth  
2 Amendment’s Due Process Clause because they impermissibly “shifted the burden of ensuring  
3 adequate notice from the foreclosing homeowners’ association to a mortgage lender.” *Id.*

4 The necessary implication of the Ninth Circuit’s opinion in *Bourne Valley* is that the  
5 petitioner succeeded in showing that no set of circumstances exists under which the opt-in  
6 notice provisions of NRS § 116.3116 would pass constitutional muster. *See, e.g., United States*  
7 *v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 745 (1987) (“A facial challenge to a legislative Act is, of course, the  
8 most difficult challenge to mount successfully, since the challenger must establish that no set of  
9 circumstances exists under which the Act would be valid.”); *William Jefferson & Co. v. Bd. of*  
10 *Assessment & Appeals No. 3 ex rel. Orange Cty.*, 695 F.3d 960, 963 (9th Cir. 2012) (applying  
11 *Salerno* to facial procedural due process challenge under the Fourteenth Amendment). The fact  
12 that a statute “might operate unconstitutionally under some conceivable set of circumstances is  
13 insufficient to render it wholly invalid.” *Salerno*, 481 U.S. at 745. To put it slightly differently,  
14 if there were any conceivable set of circumstances where the application of a statute would not  
15 violate the constitution, then a facial challenge to the statute would necessarily fail. *See, e.g.,*  
16 *United States v. Inzunza*, 638 F.3d 1006, 1019 (9th Cir. 2011) (holding that a facial challenge to  
17 a statute necessarily fails if an as-applied challenge has failed because the plaintiff must  
18 “establish that no set of circumstances exists under which the [statute] would be valid”).

19 Here, the Ninth Circuit expressly invalidated the “opt-in notice scheme” of NRS  
20 § 116.3116, which it pinpointed in NRS 116.3116(2). *Bourne Valley*, 832 F.3d at 1158. In  
21 addition, this Court understands *Bourne Valley* also to invalidate NRS 116.311635(1)(b)(2),  
22 which also provides for opt-in notice to interested third parties. According to the Ninth Circuit,  
23 therefore, these provisions are unconstitutional in each and every application; no conceivable  
24 set of circumstances exists under which the provisions would be valid. The factual  
25 particularities surrounding the foreclosure notices in this case—which would be of paramount

1 importance in an as-applied challenge—cannot save the facially unconstitutional statutory  
2 provisions. In fact, it bears noting that in *Bourne Valley*, the Ninth Circuit indicated that the  
3 petitioner had not shown that it did not receive notice of the impending foreclosure sale. Thus,  
4 the Ninth Circuit declared the statute’s provisions facially unconstitutional notwithstanding the  
5 possibility that the petitioner may have had actual notice of the sale.

6 Accordingly, the HOA foreclosed under a facially unconstitutional notice scheme, and  
7 thus the HOA foreclosure cannot have extinguished the DOT. Therefore, the Court must quiet  
8 title as a matter of law in favor of Plaintiff as assignee of the DOT.

9       **B. BANA’s Remaining Claims for Violation of NRS § 116.1113, Wrongful  
10 Foreclosure, and Injunctive Relief**

11 In its prayer for relief, BANA requests primarily a declaration that CSC and the  
12 Martinez-Avilezes purchased the Property subject to its DOT. (*See* Compl. 16:12–27). The  
13 other relief requested—with the exception of the injunctive relief—is phrased in the alternative.  
14 (*See id.* 16:16–20). Therefore, because the Court grants summary judgment for BANA on its  
15 quiet title claim, BANA has received the relief it requested. Accordingly, the Court dismisses  
16 BANA’s second and third causes of action as moot.

17       With regard to BANA’s request for a preliminary injunction pending a determination by  
18 the Court concerning the parties’ respective rights and interests, the Court’s grant of summary  
19 judgment for BANA moots this claim, and it is therefore dismissed.

20       **III. CONCLUSION**

21       **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that BANA’s Motion for Summary Judgment, (ECF No.  
22 42), is **GRANTED** pursuant to the foregoing.

23       ///

24       ///

1           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Premier One's Counterclaims are **DISMISSED**  
2 **with prejudice** pursuant to the foregoing.

3           The Clerk of Court is ordered to close the case.

4           **DATED** this 8 day of August, 2018.

5  
6  
7  
8  
9



10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

---

Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge  
United States District Judge